

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION:NO. 2652 X-12636 10/048,239 04/30/2002 William Webster Thompson EXAMINER 25885 7590 12/11/2003 MAIER, LEIGH C **ELI LILLY AND COMPANY** PATENT DIVISION ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER P.O. BOX 6288 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288 1623 **DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/048,239	THOMPSON ET AL.
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Leigh C. Maier	1623
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM		
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-4,8-10,12,13 and 16</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-4,8-10,12,13 and 16</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ul>		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.		
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent (S) (PTO-1449) Paper No(S) 10	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/048,239

Art Unit: 1623

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 14, and 15 have been canceled. Claim 16 has been added.

Claims 2-4, 8-10, 12, 13, and 16 are pending. Any objection or rejection not expressly repeated has been withdrawn. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-4, 8-10, 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BOECK et al (AH) in view of BURTON et al (CBB), as set forth in the previous Office action. Newly added claim 16 is included in this rejection.

The invention is as set forth in the previous Office action. Newly added claim 16 incorporates previously limitations.

Applicant's arguments filed September 29, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument appears to be that BOECK does not teach the spinosad:dispersant ratio recited in the claims. This assessment is based on the fact that example 13C of BOECK is outside of the claimed weight ration of 3:1 to 1:5. The examiner agrees that this particular *embodiment* is outside of this range. However, the reference teaches a wider range of weight ratios. See col 25, lines 21-33. (Although this passage refers to "surfactants," these are compounds that are defined by Applicant as dispersants.) These ranges would allow for

Art Unit: 1623

spinosad:dispersant weight ratios of 3:1 to 1:1. The overlapping range presents a prima facie case for obviousness.

Applicant further cites data regarding formulations with and without a dispersant, and that the formulations with a dispersant display unobvious advantages. However, BOECK does teach the use of a dispersant, as acknowledged by Applicant. Therefore, this comparison does not appear to be germane.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1623

## Examiner's hours, phone & fax numbers

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh Maier whose telephone number is (703) 308-4525. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday 7:00 to 3:30 (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson (703) 308-4624, may be contacted. The fax number for Group 1600, Art Unit 1623 is (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Visit the U.S. PTO's site on the World Wide Web at http://www.uspto.gov. This site contains lots of valuable information including the latest PTO fees, downloadable forms, basic search capabilities and much more.

) JAMES O. WILSON

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Leigh C. Maier Patent Examiner December 4, 2003